REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance.

Applicants present claims 1-10. Claims 3, 4, and 6 are amended to correct minor clerical oversights. Amended claims 3 and 6 now have a period (".") and amended claim 6 also includes a spelling correction. New claim 10 recites an anti-glare film in product-by-process language.

Applicants respectfully solicit reconsideration and withdrawal of the requirement for restriction. The statute requires "independent and distinct" as seen by mere cursory reading of 35 U.S.C. §121. This necessarily must follow because the MPEP §803 expressly instructs examiners as well as applicants that independent and distinct inventions can be examined in one application. *A priori* that means different classifications. *See*, Response to Requirement for Restriction, page 2. Applicants therefore earnestly, respectfully submit that a requirement for restriction simply cannot be imposed automatically by rote incantation of "different" classifications. Here, Applicants provided prior art in their IDS dated September 29, 2004 in an effort to reduce the examination burden. As a practical matter, a requirement for restriction that necessitates a divisional application means another application, which seems at odds with the current PTO road shows lamenting the accumulated numbers of unexamined applications. The only benefit here seems to be more fees collected by the PTO. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the requirement for restriction be withdrawn.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Maffitt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,114,983).

The cited Maffitt reference does not disclose both R(0) of 1% or less and R (30 or less)/R (0) of 0.001 or less.

R (0) is the regular reflectance along the regular reflection direction against incidence along the regular reflection direction against incidence aligned at any angle from 5 to 30 degrees from the normal line of the anti-glare film.

R (30 or more) is the reflectance against the incidence light, along a direction inclined by 30 degrees or more toward the anti-glare film side from the normal reflection direction.

The Maffitt reference does not appear to disclose the "R" characteristics in FIG. 4 or in FIG. 7. Attention is respectfully invited to column 3, lines 25, 30 and 40-45, and column 7, line 61, *infra*.

The Office Action refers to the Maffitt reference at column 9, lines 1-5. Applicants respectfully request clarification. It is not presently seen where this cited passage discloses or would have suggested both R (0) and R (30 or more).

Applicants further more respectfully submit the Maffitt reference does not describe the peak distribution according to claim 3. The article of the reference does not meet R (0) and R (30 or more). Besides, the assumption giving rise to the further assumption as to the peak distribution is mistaken.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S. C. §103(a) over the Maffitt reference.

Claim 9 is **Applicants'** invention, not Maffitt's.

Yet, the Office Action asserts in an apparent *ipse dixit* that "it would have been obvious . . . to use the film of Maffitt et al. over any type of known display . . . in view of the teachings . . . by Maffitt et al." Whatever the Maffitt reference says that about Maffitt's invention seems wide of the mark. Applicants submit it does not teach their invention(s). The Maffitt disclosure is not a description or suggestion of their claimed anti-glare film.

The reference to the inherency principles in the Office Action should be reconsidered and withdrawn. It is respectfully suggested that the conjecture offered in the Office Action is not the strictly enforced factual predicate that the courts require before even considering whether to entertain consideration of inherency.

Therefore, Applicants earnestly submit the rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicants courteously solicit a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Fitch, Even, Tabin & Flannery

Date: February 7, 2006

Kendrew H. Colton
Registration No. 30,368

OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE TO
Customer No. 42798

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
1801 K Street, NW, Suite 401L
Washington, DC 20006-1201
Tel: (202) 419-7000
Fax: (202) 419-7007